

- 7 -

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed toward non-statutory matter. Applicant respectfully asserts that such rejection is overcome in view of the clarification made to such claim.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 due to informalities. Applicant respectfully asserts that such objection has been overcome in view of the clarifications made to each of the foregoing claims.

The Examiner has rejected to Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion, as it is clear that the claim requires that, to perform the linking, reusable primary keys and Relational Database Management System dates are used.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Doyle (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,432). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove to each of the independent claims.

With respect to each of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on Figures 4 and 5 along with the following excerpts from Doyle to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "pre-processing said obtained operational data by a stepwise operation, wherein only the last operated on data is recorded" (see the same or similar, but not identical language in each of the independent claims).

"Embodiments of the present invention will now be described in more detail with reference to FIGS. 4 and 5 which are flowchart illustrations of operations carried out by a search and archive agent 20 and archive module 24. As seen in FIG. 4, the search and archive agent 20 may obtain user input from the search and archive definitions user interface 18 to define search topics (block 400) for the search and archive agent 20. The topic may be defined, for example, by specifying keywords for a search, by identifying an exemplary document on the topic or an exemplary

- 8 -

web site on the topic and then analyzing the document or web site utilizing Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI) or Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) to, for example, identify key words based on the document or web page contents. Systems for LSI and SVD analysis of documents to identify topics in the documents are known to those of skill in the art and, therefore, will not be described in detail herein. Other methods of defining a topic for search and retrieval by the search and archive agent 20 may also be utilized.

In addition to defining a topic for search, a user defined periodicity may also be specified (block 402). The periodicity defines how often the search and archive agent 20 will search the data sources (such as data sources 30A through 30C) accessible through the network 14 for information content on the topic. This periodicity may depend on the topic being searched. For example, if the topic being searched is information on a stock, such as price and company announcements, the periodicity may be hourly. If, however, the topic is a current event, then the periodicity may be daily, weekly or even monthly." (Col. 7, lines 30-60)

"Additionally, the information stored in the database may be the exact results of the search, such as Hyper-text Markup Language (HTML) or Extensible Markup Language (XML) documents or web pages, video or audio clips or the like, or the results may be further processed by the archive module 24 to facilitate subsequent use of the results. For example, excerpts of the results could be stored or the results could be modified by, for example, removing graphics or other data and/or communications intensive portions of the results. Similarly, a relevance ranking could be provided with the results to facilitate subsequent analysis of the results. Also, an association with other results could also be provided." (Col. 8, lines 42-53)

Applicant respectfully asserts that Figures 4 and 5 in Doyle simply disclose searching a network based on user defined search criteria, archiving results of such a search, and providing a user with the results such that the user may select the search results. Clearly, merely providing results based on user criteria does not meet "pre-processing said obtained operational data by a stepwise operation, wherein only the last operated upon data is recorded," as claimed by applicant (emphasis added). In fact, Doyle does not even teach any sort of recording of "operated upon data." Doyle only teaches extracting result data from a network, but not that such data is actually operated upon. Furthermore, Doyle does not teach recording "only the last operated upon data," as applicant claims (emphasis added).

- 9 -

To emphasize such deficiency and to further distinguish Doyle, applicant has amended such claim language in each of the independent claims as follows:

“pre-processing said obtained operational data by a stepwise operation, wherein only the last operated upon data is recorded such that data recording is avoided during data addition for efficiency purposes” (see the same or similar, but not identical language in each of the independent claims).

Applicant respectfully asserts that nowhere in Doyle is there any teaching of only recording “last operated upon data...such that data recording is avoided during data addition for efficiency purposes.”

Also with respect to each of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on Figure 4 and Col. 7, line 61-Col. 8, lines 5-53 in Doyle to make a prior art showing of applicant’s claimed “transforming said pre-processed data into subject-oriented data by utilizing reusable primary keys and RDBMS dates in an operating system of the source system to link related pre-processed data” (see the same or similar, but not identical language in each of the independent claims). The Examiner has specifically relied on Doyle’s web page link or its URL to represent the re-useable primary key and each web page topic to represent subject oriented data.

Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpt and Figure relied on by the Examiner fail to teach “utilizing... RDBMS dates in an operating system of the source system to link related pre-processed data.” In addition, the Examiner has failed to even address such claim language in his arguments following the citation in Doyle. Applicant notes that the excerpt relied on by the Examiner only teaches providing results based on user defined search criteria. However, such results do not “link related pre-processed data,” in the context claimed by applicant. Furthermore, Doyle completely fails to even mention RDBMS dates, let alone utilizing such dates “to link related pre-processed data,” as claimed by applicant.

- 10 -

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criterion has simply not been met by the Doyle reference, for the reasons noted above. A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claimed features, in combination with the remaining claimed features, is respectfully requested.

Nevertheless, despite such paramount deficiencies and in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application, applicant has substantially incorporated the subject matter of Claim 3 et al. into independent Claims 1, 2, 7 and 9 (as originally incorporated into independent Claim 5). With respect to the subject matter of Claim 3 et al., the Examiner has relied on Col. 8 lines 34-41 in Doyle as excerpted above to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "wherein said dates within said Relational Database Management System in said operating system of said source system are obtained by trigger or log-scraping of said Relational Database Management System."

The Examiner has specifically stated that a timestamp provides a date, wherein a criteria acts equivalently to a trigger or log-scraping. Applicant respectfully asserts that the timestamp in Doyle only relates to "when the results were obtained." When read in context, it is clear that applicant claims "utilizing...RDBMS dates...to link related pre-processed data" (see each of the independent claims), and not merely to provide information on when results were obtained, as in Doyle. Furthermore, nowhere in Doyle is there any teaching that the results are obtained by trigger or log-scraping of an Relational Database Management System. In fact, the Examiner contends that criteria input by a user is equivalent to trigger or log-scraping. Applicant respectfully asserts that

- 11 -

criteria that is simply input by a user cannot meet “dates [that]...are obtained by trigger or log-scraping of a Relational Database Management System” as claimed by applicant.

Again, since each and every element as set forth in the claim has not been met by the Doyle reference, as noted above, a notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claimed features, in combination with the remaining claimed features, is respectfully requested.

Still yet, applicant brings to the Examiner's attention the subject matter of new Claims 12-21 below, which are added for full consideration:

“wherein said historical data warehouse includes a standard set of core reports, components and metadata” (see Claim 12);

“wherein said pre-processing includes at least one of an ignore function, an insert function, an update function, and a replicate function” (see Claim 13);

“wherein said replicate function includes a delete function” (see Claim 14);

“wherein said pre-processing associated with said update function returns an error when associated subject-oriented data does not exist in said historical data warehouse” (see Claim 15);

“wherein said pre-processing associated with said insert function returns a warning when associated subject-oriented data already exists in said historical data warehouse” (see Claim 16);

“wherein said stepwise operation includes performing a function on immediately previous data that is not original data” (see Claim 17);

- 12 -

"wherein said related pre-processed data has different descriptions recorded over time" (see Claim 18);

"wherein said Relational Database Management System dates are utilized for placing said related pre-processed data of the subject-oriented data in a temporal order" (see Claim 19);

"wherein said Relational Database Management System dates are utilized for distinctly characterizing said subject-oriented data when a plurality of tables containing operational data with duplicate primary keys are combined in said historical data warehouse" (see Claim 20); and

"wherein said subject-oriented data is stored in said historical data warehouse with an associated creation date and deletion date derived from said Relational Database Management System dates" (see Claim 21).

Thus, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable. Moreover, the remaining dependent claims are further deemed allowable, in view of their dependence on such independent claims.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. AMDCP038).

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab, PC.

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100